OIL. GAS & MINING



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

July 25, 2013

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT 7010 2780 0002 7254 0678

Avraham Azoulay Bromide Mining, LLC 2335 NW 107th Ave STE 2M46 Miami, FL 33172-5926

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Cessation Order #MC-2013-42-03, Bromide Mining,

LLC, Bromide Basin Mine, S/017/0031, Garfield County, Utah

Response Due By: 30 Days of Receipt

Dear Mr. Azoulay:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the assessment officer for assessing penalties under R647-7.

The proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced cessation order is \$484.00. The cessation order was issued by Division inspector, Wayne Western, on May 28, 2013. Rule R647-7-103 et. seq. has been utilized to determine the proposed penalty amount. The enclosed worksheet outlines how the civil penalty was assessed.

By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this cessation order has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of this penalty.

Under R647-7-106, there are two informal appeal options available to you. You may appeal the 'fact of the violation', the proposed civil penalty, or both. If you wish to informally appeal you should file a written request for an informal conference within thirty 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Page 2 of 6 Avraham Azoulay S/017/0031 July 25, 2013

The informal conference will be conducted by a Division-appointed conference officer. The informal conference for the fact of the violation is distinct from the informal assessment conference regarding the proposed penalty. If you wish to review both the fact of the violation and proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an assessment conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. In this case, the assessment conference will be scheduled immediately following the review of the fact of the violation.

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of the violation will stand, the proposed penalty will become final, and will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the date of this proposed assessment (by August 26, 2013). Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Sheri Sasaki.

Sincerely,

Lynn Kunzler Assessment Officer

LK: eb

Enclosure: Proposed assessment worksheet cc: Sheri Sasaki, Accounting Vickie Southwick, Exec. Sec.

P:\GROUPS\MINERALS\WP\M017-Garfield\S0170031-Bromidebasin\non-compliance\MC2013-42-03\Pro Assess-MC2013-42-03.doc

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING Minerals Regulatory Program

COM	PANY / MIN	E Bromide Mining,	LLC / Bromide Basin Mine	PERMIT <u>S/017/0031</u>		
NOV	/ CO # <u>MC</u>	-2013-42-03				
ASSE	ESSMENT DA	ATE July 23, 2013	3			
ASSE	ESSMENT OF	FFICER <u>Lynn Kun</u>	<u>zler</u>			
I.	HISTORY	HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.) (R647–7-103.2.11)				
	A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall three (3) years of today=s date?					
	PREVIOUS	SVIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS (1pt for NOV 5pts for CO)		
	None					
II.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0 SERIOUSNESS (Max 45pts) (R647–7-103.2.12)					
	NOTE:	For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply:				
	1.	Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls.				
	2.	Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector=s and operator=s statements as guiding documents.				
	Is this an EVENT (A) or Administrative (B) violation? Event					

A.	EVENT VIOLATION	(Max 45 pts.)

- 1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent? Environmental Harm
- 2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

PROBABILITY	RANGE
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

***Inspector indicated that soils have been lost by contamination from petroleum spills. Since the event occurred, 20 points were assigned.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0-25

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

***Contaminated soils amounted to approximately 10 cu.yds. This is minimal extent of damage Points assigned at 1/5 of point range.

- B. <u>ADMINISTRATIVE VIOLATIONS</u> (Max 25pts)
 - 1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? ______ RANGE 0-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 25

III. DEGREE OF FAULT (Max 30 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.13)

A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, the failure to abate any violation due to the same or was economic gain realized by the permittee? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence 0
Negligence 1-15
Greater Degree of Fault 16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligent

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

***Operator should have been aware of the potential to contaminate soils with petroleum products and taken steps to prevent it. Also a prudent operator would keep regulators informed of address/contact information changes so that receipt of correspondence would be timely. Points assigned at the midpoint of the Negligence range.

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.) (R467-7-103.2.14)

(Either A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area.

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

X Immediate Compliance -11 to -20*
(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)

X Rapid Compliance -1 to -10

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

X Normal Compliance 0
(Operator complied within the abatement period required)
(Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

^{*}Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

- X Rapid Compliance -11 to -20*
 (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)
- X Normal Compliance -1 to -10*
- (Operator complied within the abatement period required)
 X Extended Compliance 0

(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete)

(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? <u>As per statements made by Inspector, this is</u> considered a difficult abatement situation.

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 11

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

***Operator took no steps to correct the problem until after being sited. Once they understood the problem they took action by hiring a qualified firm to clean up the spill. Points assigned at the low end of rapid compliance.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (R647-7-103.3)

NOT	ICE OF VIOLATION #	
I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	0
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	25
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	8
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	11
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	_22
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	\$484